

Management of Historic Srinivasa Mangapuram Temple near Tirupati

2141. SHRI M. V. MYSURA REDDY: Will the Minister of CULTURE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanam and Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) are caught in a row for the management of historic Srinivasa Mangapuram Temple near Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh;
- (b) whether it is also a fact that TTD Executive Officer wrote a letter to the Union Tourism Secretary requesting that the temple be removed from the list of protected monuments in the interest of the devotees; and
- (c) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF CULTURE (SHRIMATI AMBIKA SONI): (a) There is no dispute between the Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanam and the Archaeological Survey of India in the management of the historic Sri Kalyana Venkateswara Swamy Temple at Srinivasa Mangapuram near Tirupati. By virtue of notification dated 15.12.1956, Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams Committee has been allowed to manage the customary worship of the temple.

(b) and (c) Yes, Sir. Considering the importance of the temple, Government of India had taken a decision not to remove it from the list of monuments of national importance. However, the Triumala Tirupati Devasthanams has been advised to submit suitable proposals for developmental works to be undertaken in the temple complex for consideration in accordance with the principles of archaeological conservation.

Recovery of taxes

†2142. SHRI SURENDRA LATH: Will the Minister of CULTURE be pleased to state:

- (a) the outstanding amount of direct and indirect taxes to be recovered for the last three years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07;
- (b) the action taken to recover the outstanding amount;

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(c) whether Government are contemplating to amend the law to recover the said outstanding amount;

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI S. S. PALANIMANICKAM): (a) So far as direct and indirect taxes are concerned, amount to be recovered for the last three years is as under:

Financial year	(Rs. in crores)	
	Direct Taxes	Indirect Taxes
2004-05	98,614	15,659.09
2005-06	- 1,17,083	21,593.43
2006-07 (upto October, 2006)	1,00,936	24,570.90

(b) Recovery of arrears is an on going process. The Government has taken a number of steps to recover the outstanding amount which include constitution of Task Forces to develop and implement multi-pronged strategy for effecting substantial recovery from arrears of direct and indirect taxes. Further, so far as the direct taxes are concerned, steps taken include making it statutorily obligatory for the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal to decide such appeals, where stay has been granted, within 180 days of the date on which the stay order was passed; restricting the powers of the Commissioner of the Income Tax (Appeal) to set-aside a case or refer it back to the Assessing Officer for fresh orders; issuing comprehensive instructions for recovery of tax demand to the field units; raising the monetary ceilings in respect of various I-T authorities for exercising the powers of write-off of irrecoverable arrears; setting up of Special Units for recovery of outstanding tax dues, etc.

So far as indirect taxes are concerned, a special multi-pronged drive has been launched to recover the arrears. Special recovery cells are constituted in Commissionerates to monitor the recovery of arrears of Service Tax revenue. Further steps being taken include speedy action for recovery of realizable arrears of duty, monitoring cases before different Courts/Tribunals, moving petitions before Courts and other appellate

authorities for early hearing and disposal of pending cases and expeditious disposal of cases pending with Commissioner (Appeals).

(c) No, Sir.

(d) In view of reply to (c) above, does not arise.

(e) So far as direct taxes are concerned, the existing provisions are adequate to recover the outstanding demand. So far as indirect taxes are concerned, certain changes have been made in the indirect tax law, which are reproduced below:

- (i) New provisions have been made in the Central Excise Act, 1944, and the Customs Act, 1962 *vide* the Taxation Laws (Amendment) Act, 2006 and for Service Tax in the Finance Act, 1994 *vide* the Finance Act, 2006. These provisions provide that during the pendency of a Show Cause Notice under the relevant Act, the departmental Officer can provisionally attach any property belonging to the person on whom a notice is served, for a period of six months with the prior approval of the Commissioner. Further, the Chief Commissioner can extend this time limit upto a maximum period of two years after recording the reasons in writing. These provisions have been incorporated for the purpose of protecting the interest of revenue till the completion of adjudication proceedings.
- (ii) Provisions have also been made in the Central Excise Act, 1944, Customs Act, 1962 and the Finance Act., 1994 *vide* the Taxation Laws (Amendment) Act, 2006/Finance Act2006 to enable publication of information relating to tax evaders and defaulters. This provision has been made with a view to strengthening the statutory provisions and facilitating effective and deterrent measures for recovery of sums due to the Government with adequate safeguards.

No further amendments are presently under consideration.

Smuggling of currency notes from Quetta, Pakistan

2143. SHRI EKANATH K. THAKUR. Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Quetta in Pakistan has emerged as a major center of printing and circulating Fake Indian Currency Notes (FICNs);